

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

DANA COWAN,	)	CASE NO.: 1:14 CV 1363
	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JUDGE JOHN ADAMS
	)	
	)	
	)	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	<b><u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

This matter comes before the Court on the objections filed by Plaintiff Dana Cowan to the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the Magistrate Judge. This action was referred to the Magistrate Judge for an R&R on Cowan’s Appeal of the Social Security Administration’s decision to deny his claim for disability insurance benefits. On June 12, 2015, Magistrate Judge McHargh issued his R&R recommending that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed.

For the reasons stated below, the objection is OVERRULED. The R&R is adopted in whole and the decision of the Commissioner is hereby AFFIRMED.

**I. Standard of Review**

District courts conduct *de novo* review of those portions of a magistrate judge’s R & R to which specific objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, in social security cases, judicial review of a decision by the Commissioner is limited to determining whether the decision

is supported by substantial evidence based upon the record as a whole. *Longworth v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 402 F.3d 591, 595 (6th Cir. 2005). The substantial evidence standard is met if “a reasonable mind might accept the relevant evidence as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Warner v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 375 F.3d 387, 390 (6th Cir. 2004). If substantial evidence supports the Commissioner’s decision, this Court will defer to that finding “even if there is substantial evidence in the record that would have supported an opposite conclusion.” *Id.*

## **II. Cowan’s Objection**

Cowan filed three separate documents after the entry of the R&R. The first two documents were filed on June 15, 2015 and were not specifically titled by Cowan. The third document, filed June 24, 2015, is labeled “Objections.” The Court has reviewed these filings in their entirety. The filings, taken individually and as a whole, do not present an intelligible legal or factual objection to the Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation. Due to the absence of any legal argument, the documents filed in this instance are akin to no objection at all. For these reasons, the Court finds no error; the objections are OVERRULED.

## **III. Conclusion**

Cowan’s objections are OVERRULED. The Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is ADOPTED. The judgment of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 26, 2015

/s/ John R. Adams  
JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO